

The Pakistani military regime is exhibiting an almost pathological determination to keep South Asia in turmoil, doing little to curb Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism breeding within its borders, while scuttling others' steps toward peace.

During his visit to the region earlier this year, President Clinton threaded a needle of admonishing Pakistan for its support of violence in Kashmir while keeping the door open for engagement if it abated such activities. Unfortunately, his stern warnings have yet to exact much change. Pakistan's intended destruction of the nascent Kashmir peace process requires a firmer response from the U.S. administration. Declaring Pakistan a terrorist state, and thus putting it on par with the terrorist group it harbors and supports, would encourage the people of Pakistan to remove the military warmongers who have deprived them of sustainable development.

It is clear who wants peace in the region and who does not. Only by challenging Pakistan's duplicatious ways will peace have a hope of winning.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 12, 2000]

#### ARMED INDIA CAN HELP STABILIZE ASIA

(By Selig S. Harrison)

In May, 1998, India conducted five nuclear tests. More than two years later, the United States, with a record of 949 nuclear tests during the five decades since Hiroshima, is still enforcing punitive economic sanctions against New Delhi, poisoning the entire relationship between the world's two largest democracies.

President Clinton should quietly bury this self-defeating policy when he meets with Prime Minister Atul Behari Vajpayee at the White House this week. Pressuring India to reverse its commitment to develop nuclear weapons merely strengthens Indian hawks who oppose closer relations with Washington and favor an all-out nuclear buildup that would stimulate nuclear arms races with China and Pakistan.

The United States should accept the reality of a nuclear armed India as part of a broader recognition of its emergence as a major economic and military power. Such a shift would remove the last major barrier blocking a rapid improvement in Indo-U.S. relations. President Clinton has kept up the pressure on India to forswear nuclear weapons despite the fact that all sections of Indian opinion strongly favor a nuclear deterrent.

Instead of persisting in a futile effort to roll back the Indian nuclear weapons program, the United States should seek to influence the current debate in New Delhi over the size and character of the nuclear buildup. A more relaxed relationship with New Delhi would facilitate U.S. cooperation with moderate elements in the Indian leadership who favor nuclear restraint.

A U.S. policy focused on nuclear restraint rather than nuclear rollback should not only seek to minimize the number of warheads but also to keep them under civilian control and to limit the frequency of missile tests. Other key U.S. goals should be to get India to sign the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and to formalize de facto Indian restrictions on the export of nuclear technology.

Moderate elements in New Delhi are sympathetic to many of these objectives but need U.S. quid pro quos to make them politically attainable. For example, the continuation of sanctions makes it impossible for the Indian government to sign the test ban

without appearing to surrender to foreign pressure. Equally important, the sanctions have blocked \$3 billion in multilateral aid credits for power projects and other economic development priorities.

Together with the removal of sanctions, the U.S. should greatly reduce the blanket restrictions on the transfer of dual-use technology that were imposed after the 1998 tests. These restrictions cover many items with little relevance to nuclear weapons.

The most important U.S. quid pro quo would be the relaxation of the existing U.S. ban on the sale of civilian nuclear reactors badly needed by India to help meet its growing energy needs. Indians find it galling that China is permitted to buy U.S. reactors, while India is not.

The reason for this blatantly discriminatory policy lies in legalistic hair-splitting in the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Since China had tested nuclear weapons in 1964, it was classified as a "nuclear weapons state" under the treaty. As such, Beijing was eligible to sign the NPT, along with the other powers then possessing nuclear weapons, the United States, Russia, Britain and France.

All other states were barred in perpetuity from the nuclear club and asked to forswear nuclear weapons formally by signing the treaty. India branded the NPT as discriminatory and refused to sign. Now it would like to sign as a nuclear weapon state but the U.S. will not permit it.

The NPT itself does not bar its signatories from providing nuclear technology to non-signatories such as India. However, the U.S. Congress went beyond the NPT with a law stipulating that non-signatories cannot receive U.S. nuclear technology even if they accept International Atomic Energy Agency, or IAEA, safeguards on its use, which India is willing to do. This legislation even bars the U.S. from helping India to make its nuclear reactors safer.

Significantly, Hans Blix, the respected former IAEA director who now heads the U.N. arms inspection mission to Iraq, has urged that the ban on civilian nuclear sales to both India and Pakistan be lifted if they are willing to make two major concessions: signing the test ban and agreeing to freeze their stockpiles of weapons-grade fissile material at present levels.

"There is nothing in the NPT that would stand in the way of such an arrangement," Blix noted at a Stockholm seminar, and as matters stand, "India and Pakistan are most unlikely to discard whatever nuclear weapons capacity they possess. There is even a clear risk of a race between them to increase fissile material stocks."

The United States has been pushing India to join in a multilateral moratorium on fissile material production but without offering clear incentives. Blix has proposed a more realistic approach. U.S. policy should be based on a tacit recognition that a multipolar Asian balance of power in which India possesses a minimum nuclear deterrent will be more stable than one in which China enjoys a nuclear monopoly.

#### HONORING BETTE BELLE SMITH

#### HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2000

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, today I honor a very special lady. When I think of Bette Belle

Smith I am truly amazed. This remarkable woman is the epitome of the word inspiration. I am proud to report to my colleagues Bette Belle has been named as California's Outstanding Older Worker for 2000 by Green Thumb, Inc.

Her story is truly one of extraordinary accomplishment. Consider that she didn't enter the workforce until she was 57 years old. Now, 22 years later she's still holding the same job as a bank vice president. As amazing as that may seem, what makes this lady so special is that she is truly the queen of volunteerism.

In fact, Bette Belle has been volunteering most of her life. She began her career as a volunteer during the Second World War with the American Red Cross. Among the organizations she is involved with since then include the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, California Women for Agriculture and the 4-H Sponsor Committee, the American Field Service International Scholarship Program and AFS Committee, United Way and Special Events Committee, the McHenry Museum Society and Museum Guild and the Modesto Symphony Orchestra board.

When she walks into a room, Mr. Speaker, it's nearly impossible to say no to her. Is it any wonder why The United Way of Stanislaus County named its annual volunteerism award, the "Bette Belle Smith Community Award?" I am proud to call this incredible woman my friend. She is tireless and a fantastic role model for us all.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to rise and join me in honoring Bette Belle Smith.

#### QUALITY, NOT QUANTITY; RESULTS, NOT PROCESS

SPEECH OF

#### HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2000

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague from Seven Valleys, Pennsylvania, the Honorable WILLIAM GOODLING. BILL GOODLING has served his constituents and the nation in this body for more than a quarter century. In that time, he has proven himself a dedicated public servant, one who recognizes the importance of, as he says, quality over quantity and results over process.

That philosophy has been most apparent during his tenure as Chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee. Over the past six years, BILL GOODLING has worked tirelessly for fair and comprehensive education and labor policy. He has advocated returning control over our children's education to parents, teachers, principals, and local school districts because BILL knows that no one is better qualified to meet their educational needs than the people who interact with them every day.

In fact, very few among us are as well suited as BILL GOODLING to championing the improvement of this nation's educational system. Prior to coming to Washington, he served his community as a teacher, principal, and coach.